

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final Office Action of January 13, 2010 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14-17, and 22 have been amended. Claim 28 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 31 has been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19-27, and 31 will be pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9, 11, 12, 14-16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 9, 11, 12, 14-16, and 22 to recite a “non-transitory machine-readable storage medium,” as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 17, 21-23, 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548 to Davis, et al. (“Davis”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,383 to Fleischer (“Fleischer”).

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,279,018 to Kudrolli, et al. (“Kudrolli”).

Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,981,217 to Knauft, et al. (“Knauft”).

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, further in view of Kudrolli, and still further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,374,225 to Hejna, Jr. (“Hejna”).

Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,169,543 to Wehmeyer (“Wehmeyer”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

While Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited references teach “determining a plurality of essential words of the program title based on a meaning of the program title, wherein the plurality of essential words convey the meaning of the program title,” Applicants have amended claim 1 to further expedite prosecution of the instant application. Amended claim 1 recites, among other features, “determining at least two meaningful words in a program title, wherein each of the at least two meaningful words appears at least once in a database *containing full program titles*, the at least two meaningful words including a first word and a second word” and “determining the first word is a less descriptive word in response to determining the first word appears in the database with a greater frequency than the second word.” (Emphasis added.)

The Action alleges that the combination of Davis and Fleischer teach all of the features of claim 1. *See* Action, pgs. 6-8. Specifically, the Action asserts that Davis discloses the step of determining at least two meaningful words in a program title, wherein each of the at least two meaningful words appears at least once in a database and Fleischer discloses determining how frequently words and words phrases appear and determining that words and word phrases that appear less frequently have greater significance. *See* Action, pgs. 6-7. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Davis discloses shortening a program title by querying an editor or by comparing the program title with shortened titles stored in a library, to determine if the program title has previously been shortened. Davis, col. 17, l. 63-67; col. 18, l. 35-43; col. 19, l. 38-43; Figs. 10A, 11a, 11b. In other words, Davis describes a way of shortening a title by comparing the title to be shortened with a library of previously *shortened titles*. Thus, Davis teaches away from determining at least two meaningful words in a program title, wherein each of the at least two meaningful words appears at least once in a database containing *full program titles*, as recited in amended claim 1.

The addition of Fleischer fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis with respect to claim 1. At most, Fleischer describes analyzing a document, identifying and ranking the noun phrases

within the document based on the number of times the noun phrase occurs in the document as well as the frequency with which the noun phrase is used in the English language. Fleischer, col. 3, ll. 1-21. Fleischer fails to teach or suggest comparing the noun phrases to a database of full program or document titles and thus fails to teach or suggest “determining at least two meaningful words in a program title, wherein each of the at least two meaningful words appears at least once in a database containing full program titles” and “determining the first word is a less descriptive word in response to determining the first word appears in the database with a greater frequency than the second word,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Davis and Fleischer for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claims 9 and 17 recite substantially similar features as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 9 and 17 are allowable over the combination of Davis and Fleischer for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 21-23 and 25 depend from claims 9 or 17 and are therefore allowable over the combination of Davis and Fleischer for at least the same reasons as their base claims. Claim 28 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19, and 20 depend from claims 1, 9 or 17. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach all of the features of claims 1, 9, and 17. The addition of Kudrolli fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claims 1, 9 and 17. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19, and 20 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Kudrolli.

Claims 6 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 9, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 9. The addition of Knauff fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claims 1 and 9. Thus, claims 6 and 14 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Knauff.

Claims 7 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. As discussed above, the combination of Davis, Fleischer and Kudrolli fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 9. The addition of Hejna fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis, Fleischer, and Kudrolli with respect to claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 7 and 15 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, Kudrolli, and Hejna.

Claims 24, 26 and 27 depend from claim 17. As discussed above with respect to claim 17, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 17. The addition of Wehmeyer fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claim 17. Accordingly, claims 24, 26 and 27 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Wehmeyer for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

New Claim

New claim 31 has been added. Support for claim 31 can be found throughout the specification as filed and specifically in paragraph 20.

Claim 31 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, the art of record fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 31 is allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 31 recites, “displaying the full program title in a program title field of the electronic program guide when the program title field is magnified.” The art of record fails to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, claim 31 is allowable over the art of record for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: April 12, 2010

By: /Stephanie L. Knapp/
Stephanie L. Knapp
Registration No. 62,473

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001